

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY

OCT 28 1960

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION
& EDUCATION

Continuity and Change in American Politics

JOHN A. VIEG

ON A VISIT to the United States some years ago, Winston Churchill was invited by an enterprising journalist to comment on the Presidential election which then happened to be approaching. "No, thank you," came his prompt reply, "it's hard enough to understand the politics of my own country." There is a world of wisdom in his observation. Though the American people have by now gone through the majestic process of choosing their Chief Executive forty-three times, what will happen on this forty-fourth occasion poses—at least at this writing—as many riddles as any event in all their history.

The politics of a free society are always in flux, and it would be only natural if changes would run both wide and deep when the nation is confronted by challenges as formidable as those offered by Soviet Russia and Communist China during the past decade. Yet one prediction that can be made with

over both its immediate result and its consequences will be seen to have been determined more by the continuities of American politics than by changes born of events occurring in the Eisenhower era.

No political campaign ever literally begins *de novo*. People have interests, temperaments, memories and hopes, and these combine to assure each of the major parties a wide range of support even before the first precinct captain has rung his first doorbell. Here are the principal combinations.

While there will be numerous exceptions to the generalizations that follow and many of the categories cited will overlap considerably, the GOP can normally count among its natural and dependable supporters sizeable majorities of the people in three major economic interest groups. These include (1) the business, professional and investing classes—except in the "Solid South." (Here too, reasonable confidence is that when the election is

Special Election Issue

*We are fortunate in being able to present two very distinguished spokesmen for the Republican and Democratic parties. Senator Kenneth B. Keating of New York served in the House of Representatives for twelve years before being elected to the Senate in 1958. A lawyer, he had a distinguished record in the Army in both World War I and II. Senator Eugene J. McCarthy of Minnesota, whose political career closely parallels that of Mr. Keating, formerly was a professor of political science and sociology. His book, *Frontiers in American Democracy*, will be published on October 18. John A. Vieg is Professor of Government at Pomona College and the Claremont Graduate School. His articles have appeared in numerous journals of political thought.*

THE EDITORS

Vol. XX, No. 17, October 17, 1960 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy

however, the Republicans are gradually gaining strength); (2) the great and growing middle class, particularly the millions of families who have used their share of the nation's increasing wealth and income to buy that "ranch house in the suburbs," which is the authentic sign of middle class status; and (3) the more economically successful farm families, especially in the Middle and Far West.

Beyond the range of these tangible interests, the Republican Party also enrolls within its folds a clear majority of those who are temperamentally enamored of the *status quo*. Fully half the human race are conservative by nature and the party favoring stability, whether on economic grounds or otherwise, is their natural political home. This is not to say that the GOP is a standpat party; it is only to recognize that one source of its electoral strength lies in its appeal to those who prefer a minimum of tinkering with the social order.

As for memory and aspiration, those who identify good government mainly with Abraham Lincoln, with Theodore Roosevelt and, more recently, with "peace and prosperity" under Dwight Eisenhower, are likewise predisposed to vote Republican. They constitute another major asset for the GOP.

So too with most of those who, regardless of present status, dream of "success" primarily in terms of private enterprise. "Getting ahead" is the working philosophy of millions of Americans and many a young man discovers quite early in life that one of the simplest ways of announcing his intentions to those who count in the business world is by joining the Grand Old Party and supporting it.

Core Constituencies: Democratic

For their part the Democrats, still reaping a harvest from the social reforms they sponsored under the New Deal, draw their main and most dependable electoral support from factory workers and their families; from Negro voters in the industrial centers of the northern, central and western states; from small farmers in all sections of the country; and generally from people of low or limited incomes everywhere because, for them, the social services of government are especially important. Whether deservedly or otherwise, the (national) Democratic Party is widely regarded among these groups as being more liberal than the Republican and thus more dependable from the

standpoint of providing additional services should they be needed.

Nor are such convictions simply allowed to grow of their own accord. Organized labor long ago renounced its original philosophy of avoiding identification with either of the major parties. Since the time of Sidney Hillman and the P.A.C. in the early 1940's, its zeal in getting its members and their families to register and vote Democratic and to help finance Democratic campaigns has been equalled only by the fervor of big business in filling the coffers and backing the strategy of the GOP.

Organized labor does not own the Democratic Party any more than big business owns the Republican Party, but in both cases the ties are very close. As a matter of fact, from the long-range standpoint they are much too close for the good either of these great interest groups or of the parties themselves.

Thanks to their record for social innovation, particularly in the 20th century, the Democrats are likewise able to count among their supporters a substantial portion of those engaged in education and the arts. Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt and Adlai Stevenson have made the Democratic Party the natural home for people peculiarly interested in ideas not only for the present generation but probably for years to come. It may be true, as conservatives commonly allege, that liberals often neglect to discriminate among the ideas they generate, but the point here is simply that, as Dean Acheson once suggested, some people are so constituted temperamentally that they can be attracted only by a party genuinely "hospitable to ideas." In the United States, most people of this kind seem to gravitate to the Democratic fold.

As for memory and hope, they play major roles in sustaining Democratic strength from generation to generation too. The year 1961 will mark the centenary of the beginning of the Civil War. Yet the memory of that struggle and of its aftermath still lingers on, especially in the South, and gives the Democrats a dubious sort of head start on their opponents in every national election. Both Herbert Hoover and President Eisenhower have shown, however, that time is doing its healing work below the Mason-Dixon Line, and Vice President Nixon may enjoy similar success. Despite the fact that Jack Kennedy has Lyndon Johnson as his running mate, the Democratic nominee cannot take

Texas, Florida or Virginia for granted—and he is doubtless worried about one or two other states as well.

Considerable evidence indicates that the majority of Jews and Catholics lean toward the Democratic pole but, if so, the causes are quite different. In the case of the Jews, the explanation lies partially in the memory of generous treatment of their leaders by Wilson and FDR, and in the prompt recognition of the independence of Israel by Harry Truman. But obviously their zest for ideas inclines them in this direction too. They have a passion for education unsurpassed by any other ethnic group. For this reason as well as because of his lofty idealism, most Jews have been boundless in their admiration for Stevenson. They can hardly be expected to back Kennedy with equal devotion.

It is reported that the Democratic high command was alarmed as the campaign opened by reports that both in New York and California, where their support could easily make the difference between victory or defeat, Jewish civic leaders were lukewarm about the ticket. Stevenson has several vital roles to play in this election, but Senator Kennedy has assigned him no task more crucial than that of keeping the majority of Jewish voters—and contributors—as loyal to the Democratic Party in 1960 as they have been generally during the years since 1932.

As for the Catholics, they ordinarily vote Democratic but the explanation lies in economics far more than in religion. Their ancestors having generally been late arrivals in the stream of American immigrants, most Catholics—whether of Irish, Italian, Polish or Mexican origin—have simply not been here long enough to rise to equality in wealth or income with those whose forebears came several generations earlier. It is thus their income level that “makes” them Democrats, not their religion. Bigotry occasioned by Kennedy’s Catholicism may influence a disproportionately large number of Catholics to vote Democratic in 1960 (and proportionately an even greater number of Protestants to vote Republican), but normally the impact of “religion” on party affiliation is far less important than that of income.

Prior to 1953, there was one other group that could have been cited as forming a significant part of the Democratic core, and that was the growing body of citizens who, following Wilson and FDR, had come to believe in the necessity for increasing American participation in international af-

fairs. (Many of these were doubtless the sons and grandsons of those who in past generations had argued for free trade or tariffs “for revenue only.”) Thanks, however, to President Eisenhower’s marked success in “internationalizing” the GOP, no such general identification of internationalists with the Democratic Party could now be justified.

Presidential vs. Congressional Parties

It is one thing, however, to describe the parties in terms of their traditional alignments and thus to indicate why one is “conservative” and the other “liberal.” It is quite a different thing to suggest that the election of the Republican ticket would close the door on social progress or that the election of the Democratic nominee would lead automatically to the enactment of the liberal program embodied in the Democratic platform.

As James McGregor Burns and others have shown from the record of what has actually happened, each of our major parties has a Presidential wing and a Congressional wing, giving the U.S., in effect, a four-party rather than a two-party system. This is the explanation of the frustration to which the nation is frequently condemned even when one party wins control of both the executive and the legislative branch.

If the Democrats should win, Mr. Kennedy would doubtless propose to the Congress the adoption of a program generally in line with the liberal platform adopted in Los Angeles. Yet it is a foregone conclusion that, unless Northern Democrats *alone* should be able to command a majority of votes in both House and Senate (and this is almost beyond the range of possibility), many of the measures of his “must” list would never win Congressional approval.

The reason is simple. The President has a national constituency: the appeals and the information that come to his desk cannot help but make him moderate and will tend to make him liberal. Yet, every Congressman is elected from a local constituency and its interest may, and often will, run counter to what the President deems best for the nation as a whole.

Because of the conservatism of the Solid South, Democratic Presidents and platforms are peculiarly subject to checks and blocks of this kind, but a Republican President would in no wise be immune. Should Nixon win, he might get enough support from “modern” Republicans and liberal Democrats combined to carry through a good por-

tion of the moderate platform adopted at Chicago. But there would be wailing and gnashing of teeth among Senator Barry Goldwater's followers on the Far Right—and doubtless occasional hand-wringing among the supporters of Senators Case of New Jersey and Javits of New York. Mr. Nixon would do his best to respond to the nation's needs, but Republican Senators and Congressmen would be no more prepared to ignore the special interests of their own states and districts (and thus endanger their own re-election) than would the Democrats across the aisle.

What About the Independent Voter?

Since both of the major parties have such sizable traditional sources of support, it is often alleged that American elections are decided by the independent voters, and so, in a sense, they are. But there are several ways of being "independent" just as there are several ways of being partisan, and the voters who are independent in the best sense of the word are very rare. That is to say, only a few people have no partisan inclination whatever and make their decisions at each election solely on the basis of an informed and disinterested weighing of each candidate and party in the scale of the general welfare.

The fact of the matter is that only on the basis of self-classification is it possible to find any large number of independent voters. When Americans are asked to "classify" themselves as Republicans, Democrats or Independents, from thirty to forty per cent will choose the third category. But add the listings Independent Republican, Independent Democrat, "minor party" and "none," and the number of even approximately pure, Olympian independents drops to five per cent or less.

Ticket-splitting may of course be classified as one form of independence, and it has apparently been growing apace in recent years. Yet it is one thing to acknowledge the fact and quite another to suggest that it is productive of good government. Millions of Americans, indulging in a bit of cynicism, flatter themselves that they can "play it smart" by devising a private check-and-balance system of their own—either voting for a Republican President and a Democratic Congress or vice versa. The result is not effective government but division, frustration and sometimes deadlock, making it impossible for the government to adopt any clear line of policy.

One of the most intriguing questions relating to

the election turns upon another special type of independent: the habitual non-voter. Will he come out in droves and vote for either Nixon or Kennedy as he apparently did for Eisenhower? The GOP's extreme conservatives are trying to persuade the Vice President that his only chance to overcome the disadvantage of being the nominee of the minority party lies in appealing to the nation's non-voters. Judging by his actions thus far, however, and especially by his overtures to Rockefeller, Mr. Nixon evidently believes there is more to be gained for his cause by appealing to independents, particularly independent Democrats. He is probably right.

Issues vs. Personalities

The classic view of an election is that it should be, in Wilson's phrase, "a great and solemn referendum" on the issues of the day. And this is what every election would be if the average man could measure up to the classic ideal of democratic citizenship. But while it is true that rational issues do have their importance, it is also clear that, for many voters, reactions to personalities are far more significant.

The rational, ponderable issues in the present campaign are mainly two: which pair of nominees and which party offers the best program for accelerating economic growth and holding down inflation, and which will do the most for national security and peace? There are scores of lesser issues, to be sure, but all are related to one or the other of these two towering questions.

If the platforms and the candidates were poles apart on these fundamental issues, the election would probably be decided on largely rational grounds. But while the differences between them are significant, they are differences of degree rather than of kind. The almost inevitable result is that the personalities of the candidates (which is to say everything affecting either nominee's political image) and the emotions aroused by that third man in the ring, Mr. Khrushchev, will be the decisive factors.

These chimerical elements are the things that make the present situation so baffling. Which Nixon do the voters think is running—the old or the new? Which Kennedy do they believe is on the ballot—the man who in 1956 suggested, *sotto voce*, how advantageous it might be for Stevenson to have a Catholic as his running mate or the man who has now given the public every assurance it

could reasonably seek that he would never, under any circumstances, allow his Church to influence his official actions?

Khrushchev may, however, turn out to be the biggest issue of all. Because he symbolizes the greatest threat this nation has faced in all its history, what will probably matter most on November 8 is whether the majority of Americans believe the present administration has done everything possible to insure "peace with freedom" or whether they believe a new administration under Democratic leadership would do more and better.

These three factors are the big imponderables. But there are little puzzlers too—the drama of "grocer's boy" vs. millionaire's son; potential "slips of the tongue" in the TV debates; the cost (and

taste) of the dresses worn by the candidate's wives; the extra zeal generated by party strategists because of the potential "added purse" of being able, if victorious, to preside over legislative redistricting in many states next year; and, finally, the reaction of Rockefeller Republicans and Stevenson Democrats, the people who believe that a party should nominate its greatest leader instead of settling, out of calculation, for a cool organization man.

However the Nixon-Kennedy campaign ends, the spectacle of 177 million people proceeding to change their rulers through a free and fair election offers eloquent evidence of man's capacity for self-government devoid of violence. And in the year of our Lord 1960, humanity needs all the encouragement on this score it can get.

Why I Will Vote Democratic

IN THE last eight years politics and political issues have been somewhat homogenized. The issues have been run together. The distinction between the executive branch of the government and its responsibilities and the responsibilities of the Congress have been obscured, and even party lines have become somewhat hazy.

The process of homogenization has been encouraged by the Eisenhower administration and the Eisenhower approach to politics, which was declared to be non-political and personal. The extreme of this was manifest in the statement, credited to Leonard W. Hall while he was Republican National Chairman, that it was his objective to remake the Republican Party in the image of President Eisenhower.

We have come to a point where it is argued by many that party organizations and party policy depend primarily upon positions taken by the leader of the party, and there has developed a strong tendency to view the Presidential election principally as a choice between the two candidates. In this approach the role of the political party that each candidate heads and the function of the party platform and the issues that divide the two parties become minimized.

Of course, the character and the personality of the candidates are important considerations to be taken into account in passing judgment upon Presidential candidates. The success or failure of the President is closely related to his effectiveness as a party leader. The President can and must give

direction to the national policy. His enthusiasm or his indifference, his knowledge or lack of knowledge—all of these are important.

Considering the Personalities

In my opinion, if questions of personality alone were considered in this election, the Democratic candidate, Senator Kennedy, would come off clearly ahead of the Republican candidate. It is true that the voting record of Senator Kennedy in several fields, particularly agriculture and civil rights, is not as clearly consistent as some members of his party would like to have it. There are inconsistencies, too, in the record of Vice President Nixon and the position he has taken in the current campaign. These contradictions in the records of both candidates do not necessarily reflect a basic lack of integrity.

In making a judgment as to one's stand on a particular issue, all pertinent factors must be taken into account, and a shift in position can be justified by additional experience or a change in circumstances. There is nothing in the record of Senator Kennedy, however, comparable to the record that the Republican candidate has made in two major campaigns: the first, that in which he was elected to the House of Representatives, defeating Jerry Voorhis; and the second, the campaign in which he was elected to the Senate by defeating Helen Gahagan Douglas.

In the first campaign, Nixon newspaper ads

called upon the people to remember that the Voorhis "voting record in Congress is more Socialistic and Communistic than Democratic." And candidate Nixon himself was quoted as saying, "I welcome the opposition of the PAC [the Political Action Committee of the CIO] with its Communist principles and its huge slush fund." The Voorhis record, of course, was not socialistic or communistic; it was that of a liberal Democrat.

In the campaign against Helen Douglas, the Nixon campaigners made a rather obvious attempt at establishing some kind of guilt by association. The campaign leaflet declared: "Mrs. Douglas and Marcantonio have been members of Congress together since January 1, 1945. During that time Mrs. Douglas voted the same as Marcantonio 354 times." Nixon in a speech in the campaign is quoted as saying, "My opponent is a member of a small clique which joins the notorious party-liner, Vito Marcantonio of New York, in voting time after time against measures that are for the security of our country."

I was a member of Congress with Marcantonio following the election of 1948, and I know that there was no "small clique" that joined Marcantonio for such purpose. The voting record of any of the liberal Democratic members of the House could have been compared to that of Marcantonio with about the same result.

Again, there is nothing in the record of Senator Kennedy that even approaches the statement made by Nixon in 1952 when he declared that there was no question in his mind as to the loyalty of Mr. Stevenson, but said that Stevenson had disqualified himself from public trust by "going down the line for the arch-traitor of our generation." The fact was that Stevenson had been requested by a United States commissioner to give an affidavit concerning Hiss, and his statement was confined to his limited knowledge about Hiss at a time before proof of his activities had been established.

There is not even a shadow of anything in the record of the Democratic candidate comparable to the statement made by Nixon on November 1, 1954 in a speech in Denver, Colorado, in which he is quoted as saying, "Ninety-six per cent of the 6,926 Communists, fellow-travelers, sex perverts, people with criminal records, dope-addicts, drunks, and other security risks removed under the Eisenhower security program were hired by the Truman administration."

This statement can be placed beside the testimony of Philip Young, the Eisenhower-appointed

chairman of the Civil Service Commission, who testified toward the end of 1954 that he did not know of a single government employee who had been dismissed by the Eisenhower administration for being a Communist or fellow traveler, and who later admitted that out of 3,746 employees who were removed or who resigned for security reasons between May 1953, and the middle of 1955, 41.2 per cent had been hired by the Eisenhower administration.

The Parties and the Issues

The more important consideration, however, is the position of candidates on issues and the position of the party on issues. A careful study of the record of recent Presidents shows that their strengths and weaknesses, their achievements and failures in the political field reflect basically the position and policies of the party that they represent.

President Roosevelt was represented in his first campaign almost as a conservative. In office his actions were in the liberal tradition of the Democratic Party which acknowledged that government had an obligation to respond to the needs of the people and which reflected the fact that throughout the history of the Democratic Party it had been the haven and the refuge and the chosen political instrument of those who were suffering injustice and abuse, of those who were excluded from full enjoyment of and full participation in the political, economic and cultural life of the United States. Roosevelt may have advanced ahead of his party on some issues, but the gap was never great and it was quickly closed. The same can be said of Harry Truman.

The candidate, General Eisenhower, was represented to the public in 1952 as something more than the Republican Party. The record, however, shows that, although he may have been ahead and somewhat apart from the party on issues in the early years of his administration, as President he soon came back to the party. The basic views that he now expresses and the basic policies that he is advancing are in principle essentially the traditional ones of the Republican Party as applied in the year 1960. The term *dynamic conservatism*, declared by a special committee of the Republican Party to describe the Administration and the policies that it represents, could well have been applied to the administrations and the policies of both Harding and Coolidge.

On the basis of the record before 1952 and the

records of the last eight years, it is clear that the Democratic Party's approach to political problems is more positive and more liberal. In this century, the Democratic Party has been the party of innovation and decision in both domestic and foreign affairs. It sponsored and promoted the League of Nations and the United Nations as well as the Marshall Plan and other programs in postwar economic, military and diplomatic cooperation with other nations. It established and developed the Social Security program, which faces continuous opposition from the Republicans, the basic labor-management relations law, the Federal Fair Labor Standards law, the comprehensive agricultural programs, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority to create the vast hydro-electric and natural resources development program. It established, too, most of the basic commissions and agencies for the regulation of power and communications, and the marketing of securities.

The Republican Party, on the other hand, has been slow to accept change or innovation. The growth of big business and monopoly brought economic abuses and injustice, but the Republicans opposed regulatory laws and agencies. When we became a world power and the Monroe Doctrine was no longer sufficient as a guide for our conduct in international affairs, the Republicans opposed constructive efforts by which we might carry out our responsibilities for international peace and justice. When unemployment and business failures threatened the whole economic and social structure, they cried out against the danger of socialism and cited the laws of economics as the only ones that should be permitted to operate. They

have in too many cases, in the face of distress and the need for action, been much like the man standing on shore while someone was drowning in the water: their advice is for him to take good deep breaths of fresh air.

This inadequacy has been demonstrated within the last eight years. It is somewhat difficult to criticize the Administration, because its failure has not been limited to one special field of government activity, but has been quite general in areas of domestic as well as international responsibility. The rate of economic growth in the nation has slowed down in part because of Government policies. The fiscal affairs of government have been so managed that the national debt has increased by approximately \$20 billion, or about ten per cent. The cost of financing the public debt has increased by approximately fifty per cent. Agriculture has been in a depressed state in four out of the last five years, and unemployment during the years of this Administration has averaged nearly five per cent.

The Government has failed to respond to the needs of the people in the field of social welfare, including education, medical aid and unemployment insurance. We have lost prestige through the failure of the Administration in the field of foreign affairs. American military experts assert repeatedly that our military strength is deficient. In place of policy and program, the Administration has substituted protestations of its sincerity and its good intentions and repeatedly declared that its approach to all political problems was moral and spiritual rather than political.

The same lack of awareness or unwillingness to respond to problems is reflected in the differences between the two political platforms. The Republican platform is strong in the way of encouragement and declarations of good intentions, but weak in terms of specific programs of action. For example, both platforms pledge an increase in the minimum wage, but the Republican pledge is for "upward revision" while the Democratic calls for an increase to "\$1.25 an hour." The Republicans advocate a health program that will assist "the aged needing it, on a sound fiscal basis and through a contributory system," whereas the Democratic platform pledges "medical care benefits for the aged as a part of the time-tested Social Security insurance system." Both parties would encourage the growth of farmer cooperatives, but only the Democrats mention that they will "protect cooperatives from punitive taxation." The Republicans endorse the use of price supports for agricultural crops "at



levels best fitted to specific commodities, in order to widen markets, ease production controls, and help achieve increased farm family income." The Democratic farm plank would encourage full parity income for farmers by such measures as "production and marketing quotas measured in terms of barrels, bushels and bales, loans on basic commodities at not less than 90% of parity."

A Practical Consideration

There is a final practical consideration deserving of some attention. It is generally accepted that the Congress following the election of 1961 will be a Democratic Congress. Cooperation between Congress and the President is vitally important if constructive legislation is to be passed. We have had experience in the last six years with divided government that has made for irresponsibility on the part of both the Congress and the executive branch. It is my opinion that the measure of irresponsibility on the part of the Executive through the use of the veto and the threatened use of the veto, as well as in the number of statements that have been made to the public with the strength and the dignity of the Presidential office, has been much greater than that which has been manifest in the Congress.

Under our form of government, the office of the President is closely related to the action of the Congress. Cooperation between the President and the Congress is important. The Constitution provides no formal procedure for the coordination of Presidential action with that of the Congress aside from rather limited provisions that the President

report to the Congress on the state of the Union and that a number of his appointments be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The cooperation required in a government as vast and complex as ours has been supplied in two ways: first, through the sense of responsibility on the part of Congress and the President; second, through the political party structure. The President is theoretically the head of his party. Unless he is in fact the leader of his party, affairs often go badly. The party, on the other hand, is responsible for its President. It must be concerned about the record that is made by his administration. When the President and the congressional majority are of different parties, a positive and constructive program is most difficult to achieve, especially if the President is a Republican.

Taken altogether or separately, the qualifications and the personality of the candidates, the records of the two parties, the platforms of the two parties, and the practical consideration of the undesirability of divided government—these are the basis upon which judgment should be passed by the voters of the country in this coming election. That judgment should be based upon a full awareness of historical reality. Such a judgment, it seems to me, can come to only one conclusion; namely, that the direction of the affairs of government in the executive branch as well as in the legislative branch should be entrusted to the Democratic Party and to its candidates as representing a party which on the record has shown a willingness to face up to the difficult problems, to make difficult decisions, and to take responsibility for its decisions.

Why I Will Vote Republican

THE UNITED STATES is entering a new era. World War II ended some fifteen years ago. The long and difficult period during which the nations of the world underwent the arduous process of economic and political recovery is coming to a close. The world is again divided into two great areas of power. All of us are aware of the differences in ideology and policy that delineate East and West and affect everything that we do.

Gradually, almost grudgingly, the fields in which these two colossal systems are to compete have been defined: the thrust into outer space, the scientific drive for pre-eminence, endeavors to in-

crease economic well-being and concomitantly to raise living standards in the less developed nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America. These are the battlefields of today. What must America do? What is the best way for us to mobilize and orient our system to continue to meet the great challenge that confronts the free world? In reply, I am firmly convinced that the philosophy and guiding principles of the Republican Party will best enable us to respond to this challenge in the years ahead.

The preamble of the 1960 Republican platform notes that "the fate of the world will be deeply affected, perhaps determined, by the quality of

KENNETH B. KEATING

American leadership." This concept of a "quality of American leadership" is and always has been extremely significant. A Nixon-Lodge Administration will give America and the free world the kind of sound, responsible and mature leadership that will permit us to fulfill our deepest aspirations for the future.

America and the Free World

The United States entered the postwar era as the strongest nation in the world. We have used this strength to good advantage. We have aided and revitalized our allies and have enabled them to stand up for themselves. They are now secure and healthy, and the United States is still, both politically and economically, the world's most powerful nation.

Our \$500 billion economy is the envy of all peoples, including those of the countries of the Soviet bloc. More Americans are at work than at any time in our history. They are earning more, saving more, investing more, and building at an unprecedented rate. This progress is best reflected in the standard of living of men and women throughout America. Americans in nearly every area of our land live better than ever before.

The Eisenhower administration has guided and encouraged this progress. It has given us effective leadership and has consistently strengthened the premises upon which our democracy is based—individual liberties, freedom of opportunity, the preservation of incentives available to all.

In the international sphere, the leadership of the Administration has been forceful and impressive. We have made it clear to the Russians that we will not concede an inch of our territory or an ounce of our rights. We have told them that we don't want to fight but we will not supinely surrender our freedom. In the pursuit of this proposition, we have scored some dramatic victories, some actually military, some psychological—"Atoms for Peace," "Open Skies," the American landing in Lebanon, our active dependence upon the United Nations, which as a result is stronger today than at any time since its establishment. These and other victories clearly illustrate America's willingness to take the initiative.

More recently, the highly successful efforts of the United Nations in the Congo attest to the newfound strength of the United Nations and to the wide support it has won from uncommitted nations. These nations realize that in the final analysis the United Nations and the United States stand

for peace and human freedom and are opposed to all forms of tyranny, however subtle and however disguised.

The Role of the Federal Government

The most basic issue of this campaign may well be the difference between the Republicans and Democrats on the role of government in the Sixties. This has been referred to in very broad terms by the candidates and is reflected in both the Republican and Democratic platforms.

I like to think of this issue as being a fundamental difference as to the size and scope of the activities of the Federal government and of the governments of our fifty states. I want to place my emphasis on the phrase "size and scope" in referring to the activities of government. Although it is by no means a matter of black and white, there is a basic difference in attitude between the two parties in this area.

The Vice President, who has shown his impressive knowledge of the affairs of state in his many brilliant "on the spot" answers to questions from his audience, made this difference in attitude extremely clear in replying to a questioner during his April appearance before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. His statement of what he considers the progressive Republican point of view was widely heralded. In describing this point of view, he said:

It must look at the great social and economic problems with which we are confronted, oppose the phony schemes and the panaceas, and come up with constructive alternatives which will meet those problems and solve those problems, and produce for the future, while still preserving the best from the past.

His emphasis upon a careful study of the basic needs with which we are confronted, and, where necessary, the development of long-range "constructive alternatives" to sweeping panaceas aptly reflects the attitude of the Republican Party today. It is a reasoned and responsible approach which looks to the future. It is particularly well suited to the dangerous and complex times in which we live.

The Republican position says that the future greatness of our nation depends very largely upon the preservation of individual initiative and incentive, which are so much a part of and so dependent upon our nation's free and competitive economy. While seeking to govern effectively, we recognize that the concentration of too many activities and

of too much power in Washington—or anywhere else—tends to drain so huge a lump of every man's income away in taxes that his energies and initiative are depleted and eventually diminished altogether.

Two Sides of the Coin

The Republican Party and its candidate for President are fully aware that the coin of government has two sides—spending and taxing. In his appearance before the nation's editors Mr. Nixon spoke of the responsibilities of the President in the following terms: "Whose dollars are they talking about?... He [the President] also has a great responsibility to consider the cost of those programs insofar as whether the results to be achieved might be outweighed by the damage that would result."

This is by no means to say that Republicans are the "agin" party, which unfortunately is the impression that many of our erstwhile opponents seek to create. The prototype of the stuffy, millionaire Republican plotting for big business is certainly false. For, despite the great prosperity of the past eight years, a party of millionaires would not get off the ground.

As to big business, the Republican emphasis upon incentives and individual initiative precludes letting big business predominate unduly. The anti-trust activities of the Justice Department under the Eisenhower administration prove my point. Under the Eisenhower administration, these activities have been more vigorous and effective than at any time in the history of the Department's Anti-trust Division.

The Federal government is America's biggest business. Stop and think for a moment of the countless activities in which the government is presently engaged and which touch every day upon the lives of every American. Today, the Federal government builds and controls our defense system, provides us with an income for retirement years, regulates economic power throughout our land, insures the mortgages on our homes, helps to support many farmers, regulates the railroads and airlines, builds highways, provides loans and assistance for small business, delivers the mail, maintains national parks, collects the census, and performs a great many other functions of importance to all of us.

I do not for a moment suggest that we should not do these things. I am very definitely in favor of expanding the role of the government in those specific fields in which it is found to be necessary,

and of strengthening some of our existing government programs where there is a clear need to do so. As Republicans, we are not, however, willing to endorse an irresponsible full-scale expansion of governmental activity into every field in which we feel that those responsible could and should be doing a better job.

The Republican Party further believes in giving the state an active and key role to play, vis-à-vis the Federal government. State governments have the advantage of being closer to the people and are thus better able to analyze and fulfill certain public needs. What is more, there is a real danger that if we continue to relegate our problems to Washington, state and local governments may well degenerate and, therefore, do a poorer job in fulfilling those few functions that remain to them. (In this area, it may soon be necessary to take bold action to give to the States better sources of tax revenue, particularly in light of the many excellent sources that are now pre-empted by the Federal government.)

Civil Rights and the Eisenhower Record

The Republican Party, as I have emphasized, seeks consistently to promote and preserve economic freedom. This preoccupation with freedom is not limited to the economic sphere. The Eisenhower administration has an excellent record in the field of civil rights, and our platform pledges us to continue these efforts. More progress in this field was made in the past eight years than in the preceding eighty years.

Armed service facilities have been desegregated. The Supreme Court school desegregation decision was enforced dramatically. Justice Department action has significantly expanded the number of Negroes permitted to vote. A Civil Rights Division was established. These and many other steps in the field of civil rights clearly show that the Republican Party is the party of freedom. Much remains to be done. We recognize this and as a national political party are fully prepared to act accordingly.

When I was requested to prepare this article, I was pleased and excited to have such an excellent opportunity to make the case for my Party. I immediately thought of many ideas and of the many Republican accomplishments I intended to mention. In my enthusiasm, I hope that I have adhered to my basic objective. Let me state it.

The Eisenhower administration has succeeded admirably in many major fields. Our foreign pol-

icy has been consistent and forceful. The domestic affairs of our nation have been approached from a realistic and responsible viewpoint. Freedom has been a prime concern in our domestic economic policies and in the area of civil rights.

Dick Nixon is determined to build and expand upon this record. He is indeed well qualified to

do so, and has shown himself to be an articulate spokesman of a progressive Republican point of view. In the conduct of his campaign and in his seven and one-half years as Vice President, he has demonstrated a "quality of American leadership" that I fully believe can and will carry our nation forward to new greatness.

Continuing Editorial Discussion of Campaign Issues —

Growth, Strength and National Substance

The chief domestic issues in the campaign are those described by Republicans as "government spending" and by Democrats as "rate of growth" and the starved "public sector." Mr. Nixon summarized it, in his way, in the first of the television debates by saying that the Democrats would have the government "spend more." Almost all the domestic issues (education, health, agriculture, urban renewal, etc.) and many of the international issues (armament, foreign aid) revolve around this central difference.

In 1956, when Mr. Stevenson issued a program paper explaining how we could pay for his "New America" by the increased revenues resulting from the growth of the economy, an economist who worked on the paper said it marked the first full acceptance by a Presidential candidate of a neo-Keynesian understanding of the economy. This understanding, however, did not penetrate to the center of Mr. Stevenson's campaign; it had to wait for Mr. Kennedy.

In Kennedy's campaign the themes of the rate of economic growth and of government spending to maintain it have come to be central to a remarkable degree. He said in the television debate that he would aim, when possible, for a "balanced budget" (one cannot, apparently, give up that rather misleading symbol), but that it would be a budget balanced at a higher level of economic activity than has characterized the Eisenhower years.

Mr. Nixon's position is a mix of this more modern understanding, which he accepts more than Mr. Eisenhower did but less than Mr. Rockefeller or certainly Mr. Kennedy, and the older positions and shibboleths that appeal to the business and conservative community: opposition to government, support for the "balanced budget," condemnation of inflation, and insistence upon consumer sovereignty and private enterprise in the economy. Mr. Nixon's mixed position on welfare and spend-

ing issues is the result of the qualification of his inclinations toward modernity by the political fact that he has this business-conservative constituency, and by the (probable) intellectual fact that he shares in some measure their understanding of the economy and their system of values.

To those who still repeat the clichés about the personalities of Nixon and Kennedy being similar, and who still insist they cannot see much difference between them, one might point to the big and obviously important contrast between them in this area. Mr. Kennedy's position clearly accepts an understanding of the economy that emphasizes its complex corporate character and a system of values that is concerned with social justice.

But now, even in campaign time, we might raise some questions just within the family of those who support Mr. Kennedy's position. He speaks well, and rightly, about the need to "move ahead" again, with a greater "rate of growth." However, he constantly argues for that rate of economic growth in order for us to compete with the Russians. In the television debate, as on many other occasions, he compared our rate of growth with the Russian's, and projected the results forward into the future: we must grow faster, he said, to keep ahead of the Communists.

Now, of course, this is an important emphasis for a leader of American society in 1960 to make; what happens in the comparative economic growth of Russian and American societies will have historic importance. Also, in the logic of a campaign one can see why there would be pressure to make this emphasis. But it can be overdone. We Americans are so accustomed now to justifying everything we do by comparing it to the Russians that we may lose sight of our *own independent* goals. Are we for economic growth for any reasons of our own, aside from what the Communists do?

That brings us to a second question, also just

within the liberal family. Growth-for-anti-Communist-strength seems an inadequate (though important) objective; growth-for-growth's-sake seems inadequate, too, and maybe at some point worse than inadequate. The over-mentioned book by Mr. Kennedy's advisor John Kenneth Galbraith, *The Affluent Society*, began to raise the further question: *what* growth? productivity of *what*? tailfins or schools? A certain level of productivity, and rate of growth, is necessary for full employment, but beyond that the question is, *what* product? what mixture of goods and services? Is that not, at the last, more important than the sheer amount? The budget of the Federal government and the budgets of local and state governments, and for that matter the proportion of elements in the total national product, represent a series of important moral choices: how much do we consume today, how much invest in capital goods? how much in high cultural pursuits? how much in expense-account living? There may be built-in inclinations toward frivolity and emptiness in the rapid economic growth of an advanced, affluent society that need to be examined.

A Timely Book

If events make clear to you the need to:

- (1) face realistically the existing tensions among religious groups in American society;
- (2) discover the valid reasons behind the existence of these tensions;
- (3) learn how to think constructively and unemotionally about them;

then you will want to get a copy of *Facing Protestant-Roman Catholic Tensions*. Subscribers are invited to order copies from this office (clothbound for \$2.50; paperback for 50¢).

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBY
PHILOSOPHY-REL-EDU-PER
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH
1714 II-6CR A

The contrast between a Nixon-Republican and a Kennedy-Democratic position might turn on their relation to the theory of consumer sovereignty in the economy: the former would make it central, the latter would say it is increasingly unrealistic and ideological. In important ways consumers don't rule, and many important choices *must* be social choices. As the economy becomes more advanced, more of it goes into persuading the consumer to want what he did not hitherto want: electric drink-mixers and furs for dogs. As the society becomes more complicated and its technology more advanced, more and more significant allocations of resources must be made by the society collectively: for highways, parks, depressed areas' support, urban renewal and planning, relocation of displaced workers, public transportation and schools. As the power of the nation in the world increases, more and more of the national product must be collectively allocated to defense and international economic purposes. Let us spell out the full implications of the fact that we have to make social choices with respect to the economy, and then give the choices more discriminate examination than we have given so far.

W. L. M.

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

557 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT G. BATSON, *Assistant Editor*

M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT McAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
ROGER L. SHINN HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE
TOM F. DRIVER ROBERT W. LYNN
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS
WILLIAM F. MAY J. B. DUROSELLE
PAUL H. NITZE SIDNEY LANIER
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

CONTENTS

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN AMERICAN POLITICS
JOHN A. VIEG
WHY I WILL VOTE DEMOCRATIC
EUGENE J. MCCARTHY
WHY I WILL VOTE REPUBLICAN
KENNETH B. KEATING